




I hereby certify that this paper and every paper referred to therein as being enclosed is being placed in First Class Mail addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, as of today.

 Date: 4-21-04  
Richard T. Lyon

AP/2142-  
2700  
#13  
S. Sand  
5/6 104

PATENT  
Microsoft Docket No. 130654.1  
L&H No. MCS-020-99

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of  
Cortright et al.

: Group Art Unit: 2142

Entitled: ADDRESSES AS OBJECTS  
FOR EMAIL MESSAGES

: Examiner: L. L. Tran

Serial No.: 09/690,426

Filing Date: October 17, 2000

RECEIVED

APR 29 2004

Technology Center 2100

**RECORDATION OF THE SUBSTANCE OF AN APPLICANT INITIATED  
INTERVIEW UNDER 37 CFR 1.333**

Hon. Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The applicants filed an after-final response to a Final Office Action dated January 28, 2004 (Paper No. 8) on March 25, 2004. This response included an Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form requesting a telephonic interview to discuss the issues surrounding the rejections and the applicants' response as detailed in the after-final filing. Subsequently, the requested interview took place

between the Examiner assigned to this application, L. L. Tran, supervising Examiners Marc D. Thompson and Jack Harvey, and the undersigned, on April 5, 2004. After discussing the arguments provided in the aforementioned after-final response, no agreement could be reached. In essence, it was argued by the undersigned that the cited prior art combination in a 35 USC 103 rejection (i.e., Spencer, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,349,299 in view of Holtz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,433,800) does not teach the claimed feature of marking an email address with an adjacently placed indicator. However, the Examiners continue to rely on a teaching in Holtz of representing an action for addressing an email with an icon as teaching the aforementioned claimed feature.

The potential patentability of dependent Claims 6 and 9 was also discussed in view of the arguments presented in the after final request for reconsideration. However, no agreement was reached during the interview. The Examiners did indicate they would reassess the patentability of these claims and provide an answer in an Advisory Action responding to the after final request.

LYON & HARR, LLP  
300 Esplanade Drive  
Suite 800  
Oxnard, CA 93036  
(805) 278-8855

Respectfully submitted



Richard T. Lyon  
Reg. No. 37,385  
Attorney for Applicant(s)